

## ***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 3 July 2014

### GENERAL COMMENTS

This paper reports measurements of several parameters related to photochemistry and C metabolism in leaves of three co-occurring Mediterranean woody species during winter. Results are compared between (i) three species (*Quercus ilex*, *Pinus halepensis* and *Arbutus unedo*), (ii) two sampling periods (“mild” and “frost”), and (iii) two positions in the tree crown (sunlit and shaded). All measurements were made in the laboratory, on twigs recently collected from the field. This paper adds important data to the available information on winter performance of Mediterranean evergreen species. However,

C3232

it presents some significant flaws:

1. The two periods are not well defined: the authors are apparently comparing a “mild winter period” with a “frost/cold period” when it seems to me (from their own description) that they sampled a “frost period” and a “post-frost cold period”. As a consequence, no real “mild period” was assessed. This compromises interpretations based on the comparison between “mild winter” and “cold winter”.
2. Most of the Introduction focuses on the importance of different adaptive strategies and interspecific competition as determinants of plant community trends, particularly under climate and land use changes. However, the Discussion does not satisfactorily address these issues!
3. The paper is burdened with theoretical details concerning the measured parameters, which were many. In fact, only those parameters with the most relevant (and not redundant) results should be presented, and discussed in view of the primary aims of the study. I get the impression the authors lose themselves in a “forest” of parameters and data and miss the purpose of the whole study.

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The TITLE reflects the core contents of the work, but the word “favourable” should be checked/corrected (cf. item 1, in General Comments).

The ABSTRACT should indicate that measurements were made in the laboratory (on twigs collected from the field). The reference to the spring values should be removed since they were not obtained from the present study; the sentence in line 24-25 should also be removed because no results are presented for the weeks “after” the cold period (the cold period corresponding to 14-24 Feb, as described in section 2.3). Line 6-8: how does this relate (or not) with the outcompetition of *P. halepensis* by *Quercus* spp. you describe in section 2.2? How does this competitive disadvantage of *A. unedo* relate with the current forest trends and/or the predicted trends?

C3233

The INTRODUCTION is too long and/or not adequate for the kind of measurements and results presented afterwards (or vice versa. . .).

MATERIALS AND METHODS is an excessively long (but incomplete!) section. Examples of missing information:

1. Although the reasons for studying *P. halepensis* and *Q. ilex* can be deduced from the description of stand history (2.2), the choice of *A. unedo* is not explained.
2. How many trees/species were sampled on each occasion? How many leaves or sets of needles were measured for each parameter (e.g., the means presented in the Figures correspond to how many leaves?). In other words, provide some information about the representativeness of your samples and measurements.
3. Why was 25 °C the selected temperature for measurements?

Sections 2.4-2.11 are unacceptably long in this sort of paper. Although most of the laboratory details could be important for the correct interpretation of the results, the degree of such detail is excessive in comparison with the little or no information provided about other aspects of the methodology (cf. paragraphs above). Formulae that are of general knowledge or have been proposed by other authors (e.g.  $F_v/F_m$ , gm) could be avoided. In fact, most of these sections could be presented as an appendix to the main paper.

RESULTS about shoot growth (pg 9715, ln 21-22) refer to the 3 studied species? Where and how was this radiation measured (pg 9715, ln 25), and what was its value during the mild period? Where is Fig. 5 mentioned, in the text? In 3.4, please rephrase "representing the health of a leaf" when referring to  $F_v/F_m$ . Why are values from shaded leaves during the "mild period" not shown for *P. halepensis* and *A. unedo*? The paper contains too many tables and figures; table 3 should certainly be removed. The mild and frost winter periods should be clearly indicated in Figs. 1-9 (and the indication of the sampling periods would also be welcome in Fig. 1).

C3234

DISCUSSION needs shortening and focusing. Since no actual field measurements were performed (as far as I can understand from the present manuscript), it is not correct to imply that the present study combined both field and laboratory measurements (Pg 9719, ln 23-25). Moreover, the contents of most of this same paragraph should be moved to Materials and Methods! Section 4.2 does not discuss the presented results. You did not show that leaf position has species-specific effects because you only showed the results for one species (Pg. 9726, ln 15-18). What is an investment in life cycles (Pg. 9727, ln 17)?

The REFERENCE list is too long.

#### TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Replace Treitach et al. by Tetriach et al. Pg. 9702, ln 23 – indicate which century Pg 9716, lns 19 and 22 – please check the grammar Pg 9718, ln 9 – "most strongly pronounced" is awkward. Pg 9719, ln 21 – "though" is not appropriate (therefore?) Figs. 10, 13, 14 and 15 -  $\mu\text{mol}$  and not  $\mu\text{mols}$  The whole text should be revised for minor corrections (grammar, missing words?, punctuation)

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

C3235

## ***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**D. Sperlich et al.**

dominik@creaf.uab.es

Received and published: 17 July 2014

We would like to thank Reviewer 1 for the profound review and for the constructive comments on this paper. It will certainly help to improve this paper. Our responses (AC) to the specific comments of the Anonymous Referee 1 (Ref1) are given below each point. Moreover, we attached a pdf with the incorporated changes in our manuscript.

Ref 1: GENERAL COMMENTS This paper reports measurements of several parameters related to photochemistry and C metabolism in leaves of three co-occurring

C3555

Mediterranean woody species during winter. Results are compared between (i) three species (*Quercus ilex*, *Pinus halepensis* and *Arbutus unedo*), (ii) two sampling periods (“mild” and “frost”), and (iii) two positions in the tree crown (sunlit and shaded). All measurements were made in the laboratory, on twigs recently collected from the field. This paper adds important data to the available information on winter performance of Mediterranean evergreen species. However, it presents some significant flaws:

Answer (AC): Thank you for the positive feedback concerning the importance of our work. Regarding the asserted flaws, we have endeavored to solve all criticized points. Find kindly our responses point by point in the following text.

Ref 1: 1. The two periods are not well defined: the authors are apparently comparing a “mild winter period” with a “frost/cold period” when it seems to me (from their own description) that they sampled a “frost period” and a “post-frost cold period”. As a consequence, no real “mild period” was assessed. This compromises interpretations based on the comparison between “mild winter” and “cold winter”.

Answer (AC): Thank you for pointing out the error which was introduced by wrongly defining the dates for the first field campaign taking place in the mild period. Here we clarify: Sampling field campaign 1 9.1- 19.1. (DOY 9-19) Frost/chilly phase 19.1.-4.2 (DOY 21-35) Sampling field campaign 2 14.2.-24.2. (DOY 45-55) After this correction the definition of the field campaigns and also the choice of the title became certainly clearer.

Ref 1: 2. Most of the Introduction focuses on the importance of different adaptive strategies and interspecific competition as determinants of plant community trends, particularly under climate and land use changes. However, the Discussion does not satisfactorily address these issues!

Answer (AC): Referee 1 points out that there are several arguments in the introduction being unaddressed in the discussion concerning different adaptive strategies and interspecific competition as determinants of plant community trends. We have revised now

C3556

our introduction and we have tried to foster our arguments so that they are better related to the observed eco-physiological behaviour presented in the results. We rewrote the section from L. 27 Pg.9699 to L. 19 Pg. 9700 when discussing adaptive strategies, phenotypic plasticity, and genotypic evolution. We have focused more on the physiological mechanism which explains frost induced changes in the foliar photosynthetic apparatus and tied it stronger to our objectives.

Ref 1: 3. The paper is burdened with theoretical details concerning the measured parameters, which were many. In fact, only those parameters with the most relevant (and not redundant) results should be presented, and discussed in view of the primary aims of the study. I get the impression the authors lose themselves in a “forest” of parameters and data and miss the purpose of the whole study.

Answer (AC): We agree that we provide an ample set of parameters, but those parameters provide valuable information to fulfill our objectives (introduction) by combining two independent methods, namely gas exchange (GE) and chlorophyll fluorescence (CF). The two methods inform on the photosynthetic machinery from different angles and together define much better stress effects in the carbon and light reactions. They provide valuable new information when combined (e.g.  $g_m$ ,  $C_c$  or  $J_{amb}$  – Anet relationship). In many gas exchange studies, interesting CF-parameters such as NPQ,  $F_v/F_m$  or others are neglected despite its ease to measure and the potential information they contain. However, we have accepted the suggestion to do some “thinning” in our “forest of parameters” and we have tried to find a compromise between reducing the amount of parameters and not losing interesting information. We have removed Fig 7 A, Fig. 7 B, and Fig. 9 B. Furthermore, we have restructured figures 10, 12 and 14 and also 11,13 and 15, so that they are now merged in one figure each (10 A,B,C and 11 A,B,C), reducing thus the space utilized.

Ref 1: SPECIFIC COMMENTS The TITLE reflects the core contents of the work, but the word “favourable” should be checked/corrected (cf. item 1, in General Comments).

C3557

Answer (AC): We have corrected the wrong labelling of the measurement dates in Material and Methods (see answer above) and the title should make sense now.

Ref 1: The ABSTRACT should indicate that measurements were made in the laboratory (on twigs collected from the field). The reference to the spring values should be removed since they were not obtained from the present study; the sentence in line 24-25 should also be removed because no results are presented for the weeks “after” the cold period (the cold period corresponding to 14-24 Feb, as described in section 2.3).

Answer (AC): We have included in the abstract the information that measurements were conducted on excised leaves in the laboratory, have deleted the reference to the spring values and also the sentence in line 24-25.

Ref 1: Line 6-8: how does this relate (or not) with the outcompetition of *P. halepensis* by *Quercus* spp. you describe in section 2.2?

Answer (AC): Thanks for this question helping to clarify this sentence. We had flipped unintentionally the order of “photoinhibition-avoiding (*P. halepensis*) and photoinhibition-tolerant (*Q. ilex*)” in line 6-8, p.9699. It should be reverse as described in line 11-14, p.9728. We have now corrected the sentence: “photoinhibition-avoiding (*Q. ilex*) and photoinhibition-tolerant (*P. halepensis*)”. Now it should make sense in respect to the early-successional behavior of *P. halepensis* described in section 2.2 and its photoinhibition-tolerance in sunny environments after occupying disturbed areas, and the late-successional strategy of *Q. ilex* which induces much earlier a photoprotective mechanism and “stand-by” mode, therefore being photoinhibition-avoiding.

Ref 1: How does this competitive disadvantage of *A. unedo* relate with the current forest trends and/or the predicted trends?

Answer (AC): Thanks for pointing this out. We have now added information to clarify this point. The scattered occurrence of *A. unedo* in the closed forest reflects its com-

C3558

petitive disadvantage. Generally, *A. unedo* is abundant in open macchia ecosystems as a shrub sharing the habitat with other semi-deciduous or deciduous shrubs. However, under specific circumstances, *A. unedo* appears as a mature tree in the forest canopy. In the long-run of forest succession and canopy closure it would depend on disturbances to regenerate.

Ref 1: The INTRODUCTION is too long and/or not adequate for the kind of measurements and results presented afterwards (or vice versa. . .).

Answer (AC): As already outlined above in our answer after general comment Nr. 2, in our introduction we tried to link general aspects of global climate changes effects on species distribution in the Mediterranean to the specific topic of this work. We think that our way facilitates to enter such a physiological topic and to create awareness for a broader scientific community for which this special issue was designed. However, we do agree that the introduction is long and we have worked on it to make it shorter and more concise as already explained above after the general comment. The introduction counts now 777 words (previously: 958).

Ref 1: MATERIALS AND METHODS is an excessively long (but incomplete!) section. Examples of missing information: 1. Although the reasons for studying *P. halepensis* and *Q. ilex* can be deduced from the description of stand history (2.2), the choice of *A. unedo* is not explained.

Answer (AC): We pointed out that *A. unedo* enriches the tree species diversity despite being rather characterised as a shrubby species abundant in the macchia ecosystems (Beyschlag et al., 1986; Reichstein et al., 2002). (L. 12-15 pg. 9703). However, we included some supporting information why we included *A. unedo* in our study in section 2.3 pointing out the ecological value and the unusual occurrence as a mature tree in the forest canopy.

Ref 1: 2. How many trees/species were sampled on each occasion? How many leaves or sets of needles were measured for each parameter (e.g., the means presented in the

C3559

Figures correspond to how many leaves?). In other words, provide some information about the representativeness of your samples and measurements.

Answer (AC): Generally, we sampled 5 twigs of the sunlit and shaded crown for every tree species. Thus, the parameters were obtained on maximum 5 leaves except in those cases when we had to delete the data because of noisy responses and/or patchy stomatal openness. We have now clarified this point and we have provided more data about the sample size.

Ref 1: 3. Why was 25 °C the selected temperature for measurements?

Answer (AC): 25 °C is the standard temperature for gas exchange measurements as it is assumed to be optimal for photosynthesis (Taz and Zeiger, 2010). Moreover, carbon or light response curves are always conducted on this reference temperature also because of the Rubisco enzyme kinetic parameters (Table 3) used in the Farquhar equations are provided for 25 °C (Bernacchi et al., 2002).

Ref 1: Sections 2.4-2.11 are unacceptably long in this sort of paper. Although most of the laboratory details could be important for the correct interpretation of the results, the degree of such detail is excessive in comparison with the little or no information provided about other aspects of the methodology (cf. paragraphs above). Formulae that are of general knowledge or have been proposed by other authors (e.g.  $F_v/F_m$ ,  $g_m$ ) could be avoided. In fact, most of these sections could be presented as an appendix to the main paper.

Answer (AC): We agree that in total these sections are quite long. In the previous version we had considered it important to depict a complete and reproducible set of the equations for the parameters we used. This is because despite having chlorophyll fluorescence (CF) tools readily available in most of the gas exchange systems, these CF-derived parameters are often neglected in gas exchange studies. In any case, we have now followed the referee's suggestion and have reduced the length of M&M accordingly by moving several sections to the appendix including the equations and

C3560

explanations of Fv/Fm, PhiPSII, NPQ, qP and the section 2.9.

Ref 1: RESULTS about shoot growth (pg 9715, ln 21-22) refer to the 3 studied species?

Answer (AC): Yes, the shoot growth refers to all species (see L.21 p. 9715).

Ref 1: Where and how was this radiation measured (pg 9715, ln 25), and what was its value during the mild period?

Answer (AC): Thank you to help to clarify this point. We have provided now this information in our text as follows: "Sensors for measuring air temperature (HMP45C, Vaisala Oyj, Finland) and solar radiation (SP1110 Skye Instruments Ltd., Powys, UK) were installed at a height of 3 m, in a clearing ca. 1 km from the plot. The average radiation in the mild winter period (9-19.01.12 or DOY 9-19) was 46 W m<sup>-2</sup>."

Ref 1: Where is Fig. 5 mentioned, in the text?

Answer (AC): Thank you for pointing this out. We had referred to the wrong figure in the text in l.23 p.9716. Instead of Fig.4a and b, it should be Fig.5a and b. We have now corrected it.

Ref 1: In 3.4, please rephrase "representing the health of a leaf" when referring to Fv/Fm.

Answer (AC): We have corrected the wording and we have replaced it by "stress indicator".

Ref 1: Why are values from shaded leaves during the "mild period" not shown for *P. halepensis* and *A. unedo*?

Answer (AC): We did not want to include more information which is only of marginal relevance, as we are comparing primarily the difference between the two winter periods and no information for the shaded leaves of *P. halepensis* and *A. unedo* is available for the second winter campaign. Information in both winter periods is only available for the shaded leaves of *Q. ilex* (see Material and Methods, section 2.3, pg. 9704).

C3561

Nonetheless, we have tried to clarify this point in section 2.3.

Ref 1: The paper contains too many tables and figures; table 3 should certainly be removed.

Answer (AC): We have removed this table.

Ref 1: The mild and frost winter periods should be clearly indicated in Figs. 1-9 (and the indication of the sampling periods would also be welcome in Fig. 1).

Answer (AC): We have indicated now the two periods and have added in Figure 1 the sampling periods.

Ref 1: DISCUSSION needs shortening and focusing.

Answer (AC): Thanks for helping to improve our discussion. We shortened the discussion counting now 2693 words (previously: 3564).

Ref 1: Since no actual field measurements were performed (as far as I can understand from the present manuscript), it is not correct to imply that the present study combined both field and laboratory measurements (Pg 9719, ln 23-25). Moreover, the contents of most of this same paragraph should be moved to Materials and Methods!

Answer (AC): We have removed now this section from the discussion and moved the relevant information to Material and Methods.

Ref 1: Section 4.2 does not discuss the presented results.

Answer (AC): We have removed this section.

Ref 1: You did not show that leaf position has species-specific effects because you only showed the results for one species (Pg. 9726, ln 15-18).

Answer (AC): We have corrected this section and refer now only to *Q. ilex*.

Ref 1: What is an investment in life cycles (Pg. 9727, ln 17)?

C3562

Answer (AC): We meant that leaves of *A. unedo* have a shorter life cycle meaning they are shed and replaced earlier (1-2 years) in comparison to, for instance, *Q. ilex* which keeps its leaves intact for 2 to 3 years or even longer. We have clarified this point now.

Ref 1: The REFERENCE list is too long.

Answer (AC): The references list was reduced and counts now 3480 words (previously: 4042).

Ref 1: TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS Replace Treitach et al. by Tetriach et al.

Answer (AC): We replaced this citation. Note that the correct citation is Tretiach et al.

Ref 1: Pg. 9702, ln 23 – indicate which century

Answer (AC): We indicated now the century in the text.

Ref 1: Pg 9716, lns 19 and 22 – please check the grammar Pg 9718, ln 9 – “most strongly pronounced” is awkward.

Answer (AC): We have corrected the wording: “mostly pronounced”.

Ref 1: Pg 9719, ln 21 – “though” is not appropriate (therefore?)

Answer (AC): Corrected.

Ref 1: Figs. 10, 13, 14 and 15 -  $\mu\text{mol}$  and not  $\mu\text{mols}$

Answer (AC): Corrected.

Ref 1: The whole text should be revised for minor corrections (grammar, missing words?, punctuation)

Answer (AC): We have reviewed the text for minor corrections.

References: Bernacchi, C. J., Portis, A. R., Nakano, H., Caemmerer, S. Von and Long, S. P.: Temperature Response of Mesophyll Conductance . Implications for the Determination of Rubisco Enzyme Kinetics and for Limitations to Photosynthesis in Vivo, *Plant*

C3563

*Physiol.*, 130, 1992–1998, doi:10.1104/pp.008250.water, 2002. Beyschlag, W., Lange, O. L. and Tenhunen, J. D.: Photosynthesis und Wasserhaushalt der immergrünen mediterranen Hartlaubpflanze *Arbutus unedo* L. im Jahresverlauf am Freilandstandort in Portugal I. Tagesläufe von CO<sub>2</sub>-Gaswechsel und Transpiration unter natürlichen Bedingungen, *Flora*, 178, 409–444, 1986. Reichstein, M., Tenhunen, J. D., Rouspard, O., Ourcival, J.-M., Rambal, S., Dore, S. and Valentini, R.: Ecosystem respiration in two Mediterranean evergreen Holm Oak forests: drought effects and decomposition dynamics, *Funct. Ecol.*, 16(1), 27–39, doi:10.1046/j.0269-8463.2001.00597.x, 2002. Taz, L. and Zeiger, E.: *Plant Physiology - 5th Edition*, edited by L. Taz and E. Zeiger, Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland., 2010.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/11/C3555/2014/bgd-11-C3555-2014-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 28 July 2014

Dear authors,

thank you for your reply to my comments on the first version of your manuscript; I'm glad they helped you to improve it.

I read your second version and I would like to call your attention to the following:

1- After figure 8, check the numbering of Figures in the text and in the captions (there is no Fig. 9, for example); and at least one reference to Fig 7 in the text seems wrong (you probably mean another figure).

C3862

2- I did not find the correction you mention in your reply concerning the "health of a leaf"...

3- Instead of "leaf life-cycle" I suggest "leaf longevity" or "leaf lifespan"

4- Please revise the text, particularly the sections you changed in the second version; some grammar corrections are needed - e.g. "able to photosynthesize" instead of "able to photosynthesis", "...which was significant for the former (Fig. 4A) and low significant for the latter parameter...", "Angiosperms are known to make efficiently use of ..." ("to make efficient use" or "to efficiently use"), among others.

5- Thank you for correcting me (Tretiach et al)!

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

C3863



***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**D. Sperlich et al.**

dominik@creaf.uab.es

Received and published: 13 August 2014

We thank Referee 1 for the comments on the improved version of our manuscript.

1 - We checked and corrected the numbering of figures and figure references in the text.

2&3 - We changed the wording to "leaf longevity".

4 - We revised the paragraphs and corrected the text how Referee 1 suggested.

C4357

Thanks again for the time and effort spent to help to improve our manuscript.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

C4358

***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**V. Brovkin (Referee)**

victor.brovkin@zmaw.de

Received and published: 30 July 2014

Dear Dr. Sperlich,

as the editor, I was unable to find the 2nd reviewer of the manuscript, therefore I reviewed the manuscript myself. I noticed that the manuscript was revised in the process of interactive discussion and uploaded as supplementary material, which is rather unusual for the editorial process in Biogeosciences. I therefore read the revised manuscript and did my comments based on your response to the comments of the 1st

C3937

reviewer.

The revised manuscript is easy to read and it is not as long as the original version (the length, particularly of the introduction, was my concern from the beginning of the editorial process). The manuscript summarizes well results of novel, interesting research and fits well into the scope of Biogeosciences. I have minor comments of the editorial origin:

- Figures 2 to 8 are done in the format of line plots just for 2 case studies. Values on intermediate line points have no meaning which makes the line plots not really appropriate for the graphical presentation of these data. Please consider making a bar diagram at least for some of these figures;
- The figures as they are now are blurry; this should be improved in the final manuscript version;
- Reconsider whether you need Figs. 10 and 11. Right now, they are not discussed much in the paper and are absent in the figure caption list;
- Table 1: Explain what is the “all” case and add units;
- Figure 8: add a legend on the plot.

To facilitate the review process after the end of the interactive discussion phase, please upload the newly revised manuscript and a response letter to the comments listed above and the second set of comments by the 1st reviewer.

Yours sincerely,

Victor Brovkin

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

C3938

***Interactive comment on “Foliar photochemical processes and carbon metabolism under favourable and adverse winter conditions in a Mediterranean mixed forest, Catalonia (Spain)” by D. Sperlich et al.***

**D. Sperlich et al.**

dominik@creaf.uab.es

Received and published: 25 August 2014

Dear Dr. Brovkin,

Thank you very much for the thorough reading of our manuscript and your positive comments. Our responses to each comment are given below each point:

Figures 2 to 8 are done in the format of line plots just for 2 case studies. Values on intermediate line points have no meaning which makes the line plots not really appropriate for the graphical presentation of these data. Please consider making a bar

C4617

diagram at least for some of these figures;

- In the initial version of our manuscript, we thought it makes it visually more attractive to use line points in order to highlight the change between the two periods for each tree species. However, we considered the constructive criticism and changed our line point diagrams to bar plots (figure 2-8).

The figures as they are now are blurry; this should be improved in the final manuscript version;

- We will provide high resolution figures for the final version of our manuscript after the end of the discussion phase.

Reconsider whether you need Figs. 10 and 11. Right now, they are not discussed much in the paper and are absent in the figure caption list;

- When rearranging our figures in the revised manuscript we confused the order as also Referee 1 pointed out. Figure 10 and 11 should be numbered 9 and 10. They are presented in the section 3.5. We have corrected this now. If possible, we would like to keep these figures as we discuss them in section 4.3 and 4.4 and we consider them to be worth publishing and sharing them with other physiologists.

Table 1: Explain what is the “all” case and add units;

- In this table we presented the P- values of Student’s t-tests for the differences between sunlit and shaded leaves of *Q. ilex* for different periods (unitless). We corrected the labeling as follows: All -> both periods Mild -> mild period Frost -> frost period

Figure 8: add a legend on the plot.

- Corrected.

To facilitate the review process after the end of the interactive discussion phase, please upload the newly revised manuscript and a response letter to the comments listed above and the second set of comments by the 1st reviewer.

C4618

- We have replied also to the comments of Referee 1 and uploaded now a new revised version of the manuscript including all changes following Referee 1 and 2.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/11/C4617/2014/bgd-11-C4617-2014-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 9697, 2014.

C4619